Page 15

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In

the Office Action of September 15, 2010, claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 12-24 were

previously withdrawn and remain withdrawn.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 7 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianco et

al. (US 6,256,737). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus that

associates a public key certificate with a person identification certificate.

This is clearly unlike Bianco which fails to disclose or even fairly suggest an information

processing apparatus that associates a public key certificate with a person identification

certificate. Instead, Bianco discloses allowing a user access to "all digital certificates" stored on

a device after the user has been validated by a biometric device. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6.256,737,

Col. 54, l. 40-60. This cannot be fairly viewed an information processing apparatus that

associates a public key certificate with a person identification certificate because Bianco merely

granting access to all digital certificates in a system after the user is authenticated without linking

any template to any public key.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing an information processing

apparatus that associates a public key certificate with a person identification certificate, the

location of a public key used for authentication is quickly identified after personal identification

- 15 -

Response to September 15, 2010 Office Action Application No. 09/944,501 Page 16

which allows for faster authentication between devices . See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0026427, Para. [0502].

Therefore, because *Bianco* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 cannot stand. Because claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Response to September 15, 2010 Office Action Application No. 09/944,501 Page 17

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 15, 2010 By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger Registration No. 32,919 SNR Denton US LLP

P.O. Box 061080 Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000

12604746\V-1